

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/092,750	03/07/2002	Philip W. Hammond	50036/050002	2879	
31020 75	90 05/10/2004		EXAMINER		
CLARK & ELBING LLP 101 FEDERAL STREET			CANELLA, KAREN A		
BOSTON, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1642	1642	
			DATE MAIL ED: 05/10/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/092,750	HAMMOND ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Karen A Canella	1642				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	•					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	о п					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Linterview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa					

Art Unit: 1642

DETAILED ACTION

Acknolwedgemnt is made of applicants election with traverse of Group I drawn to polypeptides, and the election of the species of SEQ ID NO:60. The traversal is on the grounds that the search for all the groups together would not be an undue burden. this has been considered but not found persuasive. the restriction was set forth as follows:

- I. Claims 1 and 2 drawn to substantially pure Bcl-XL binding polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclasses 300 and 350.
- II. Claims 3-8, drawn to the isolated nucleic acids encoding the polypeptides of Invention I, vectors and host cells thereof, classified in class 536, subclasses 23.5 and class 435, subclasses 252.3, 320.1 and 325.
- III. Claims 20-26 drawn to methods of source labeling a nucleic acid-fusion molecule, the source labeled nucleic acids and fusion proteins obtained thereby, and a method for identifying the source of the nucleic acid portion of said fusion molecule, class 435, subclass 91.5, class 536, subclass 23.1, class 530, subclass 402, and class 435, subclass 6.
- IV. Claims 9-19 drawn to method for identifying a Bcl-XL binding polypeptide comprising contacting a source labeled polypeptide with a Bcl-XL polypeptide and a method for identifying a compound that modulates the binding between a Bcl-XL polypeptide and a Bcl-XL-binding polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

It is noted that all the groups are classified differently necessitating a separate search in the US patent shoes. Further, the literature search, particularly relevant in this art is not coextensive and different patentability issues apply to each group. The examiner contends that it would be undue experimentation to search all of the pending groups. However, during the course of examination of the elected Group, it was noted that SEQ ID NO:60 was free of the prior art, and many of the other claimed SEQ NO were also free of the art. In order to advance prosecution, all claimed SEQ ID NO were searched within the scope of claims 1 and 2.

The restriction requirement is deemed proper and adhered to. The restriction requirement is therefore made final.

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 3-26, drawn to non-elected inventions, are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 2 are examined on the merits.

Art Unit: 1642

Priority

Acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim to an earlier effective filing date through provisional application 60/274,526. Upon review of said provisional it was noted that the application lacked a written description of SEQ ID NO:224-228. Accordingly, claim 1 which incorporates the subject matter of SEQ ID NO:224-228 will be given the priority date of March 7, 2002 rather than the effective filing date of March 8, 2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "substantially pure" in claims 1 and 2 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially pure" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1642

Claim 1 is drawn to a substantially pure human Bcl-xL-binding polypeptide, said polypeptide comprising the sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO:4-50, 63-71 and 224-228. The specification states on page X, lines Y-Z that the instant invention encompasses peptides consisting of rather than "having" or "comprising" SEQ ID NO:4-50, 63-71 and 224-228. Thus, the amendment altering the scope of claim 1 to "comprising" has broadened the scope of the originally described invention. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that applicant was not in possession of the polypeptides "comprising" SEQ ID NO:4-50, 63-71 and 224-228 at the time the invention was filed.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hammond et al (Journal of Biological Chemistry, Jun 2001, Vol. 276, pp. 20898-20906) or Giordano et al (CA 2,343,602) or Ruben et al (WO 01/22920).

Claim 1 is drawn in part to a substantially pure human Bcl-xL-binding polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO:25.

Hammond et al (Journal of Biological Chemistry, Jun 2001, Vol. 276, pp. 20898-20906)

Hammond et al disclose the unknown protein encoded from clone V72, unknown protein encoded from clone Y37 and unknown protein encoded from clone Y01, wherein said unknown proteins are identical to SEQ ID NO:46, 33 and 48, respectively (page 2094, Table III)

Giordano et al (CA 2,343,602) disclose the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:22815 which comprises SEQ ID NO:25 as evidenced by the attached Registry Number (599403-48-02) underlined portion.

Ruben et al (WO 01/22920) disclose the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:5827 which comprises SEQ ID NO:25 as evidenced by the attached Registry Number (334566-32-4) underlined portion.

Neither Ruben nor Giordano et al specifically teach that the polypeptides bind to Bcl-xL, however, the claimed polypeptides appears to be the same as the prior art polypeptides, absent a showing of unobvious differences. The office does not have the facilities and resources to provide the factual evidence needed in order to establish that the product of the prior art does not possess the same material, structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the burden is on the applicant to prove that the claimed

Art Unit: 1642

product is different from those taught by the prior art and to establish patentable differences. See In re Best 562F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and Ex parte Gray 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zhu et al (WO 99/13075).

Claim 1 is drawn in part to a substantially pure human Bcl-xL-binding polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO:25.

Zhu et al (WO 99/13075) disclose the protein p44 (Sequence Identifier No. 10, Registry No. 221221-63-2) which comprises SEQ ID NO:25 at residues 398-430. Zhu et al does not specifically disclose that the p44 protein would bind to Bcl-xl, however, it is recognized in the art that viruses express proteins which interfere with the normal onset of programmed cell death in order to propagate in the host.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brissette et al (WO 03/38130) or Tang et al (WO 03/31595).

Claim 1 is drawn in part to a substantially pure human Bcl-xL-binding polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO:18, SEQ ID NO:22 or SEQ ID NO:45..

Brissette et al (WO 03/38130) disclose a human 714 amino acid protein in Figure 3 comprising SEQ ID NO:18 at residues 555-582 as evidenced by that attached Registry structure (480644-87-9) and the SREBP-1 protein comprising SEQ ID NO:22 at residues at residues 594-620 as evidenced by that attached Registry structure (391970-32-4).

Tang et al (WO 03/31595) disclose the protein encoded by the human clone 784CIF2b 869 (Registry No. 352383-01-8) which comprises SEQ ID NO:45.

Neither Brissette et al nor Tang et al specifically disclose that the proteins binds to Bcl-xL, however, the claimed polypeptides appears to be the same as the prior art polypeptides, absent a showing of unobvious differences. The office does not have the facilities and resources to provide the factual evidence needed in order to establish that the product of the prior art does not possess the same material, structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the burden is on the applicant to prove that the

Art Unit: 1642

claimed product is different from those taught by the prior art and to establish patentable differences. See In re Best 562F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and Ex parte Gray 10 USPQ 2d

Page 6

1922 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen A Canella whose telephone number is (571)272-0828. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 a.m. to 9 p.m. M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571)272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Karen A. Canella, Ph.D.

MANA CANELLA PH D